



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/691,456	10/18/2000	Hisamitsu Suzuki	NECN 17.893	5653

26304 7590 07/01/2002

KATTEN MUCHIN ZAVIS ROSENMAN
575 MADISON AVENUE
NEW YORK, NY 10022-2585

EXAMINER

GEBREMARIAM, SAMUEL A

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2811

DATE MAILED: 07/01/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/691,456

Applicant(s)

SUZUKI, HISAMITSU

Examiner

Samuel A Gebremariam

Art Unit

2811

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 October 2000.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 09/691,456.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 3.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 1, is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hiramoto et al. US patent No. 5,661,329.

Regarding claim 1, Hiramoto et al. teach a semiconductor device (fig. 2) comprising a silicon substrate 1, a bipolar transistor having a collector well 2 having a first conductivity -type, an intrinsic base region 5 having a second conductivity-type received in the collector well and an emitter region 6 having first conductivity type and received in the intrinsic base region, a first annular isolation trench 7 encircling the collector well, a second annular isolation trench 8 encircling the first annular isolation trench and an annular diffused region 2 (the area between annular isolation trenches 7 and 8), that is also in contact with first and second isolation trenches.

Hiramoto does not explicitly teach the annular diffused region 2 being second conductivity type.

It is conventional to dope the regions between isolation trenches with either p or n type conductivity.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the annular diffused region of Hiramoto's structure to have the conductivity type as claimed.

Claims 2-10, are rejected as being unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hiramoto et al. in view of Nii et al. US patent No. 5,933,719.

Regarding claim 2, Hiramoto teaches substantially the entire claimed structure, as applied to claim 1, above including, intrinsic base and collector well regions provided with both base and collector electrodes (column 5, lines 38-55). Hiramoto does not teach base and collector electrodes and annular diffused regions are provided with a silicide layer on top thereof. Nii teaches in fig. 20, a metal silicide formed on the base and collector electrode (column 13, lines 13-24). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a silicide layer in Hiramoto's device since silicides are known materials that are used for lowering contact resistance.

Regarding claim 3, Hiramoto teaches a semiconductor device as in claim 1 comprising a MOSFET (column 1, lines 11-20).

Regarding claim 4, Hiramoto teaches the annular diffused region includes annular sub-region including a plurality of first diffused regions and a second intermittent annular sub-region including a plurality of second diffused regions, and the first diffused regions and the second diffused regions are arranged alternately along the annular diffused region (fig 11c).

Regarding claim 5, Hiramoto teaches a third annular isolation trench between first intermittent annular region and second intermittent region (column 14, lines 38-68, column 15, lines 3-5).

Regarding claim 6, Hiramoto teaches a semiconductor device of claim 1, where the silicon substrate has a second conductivity type (column 5, lines 33-37).

Regarding claim 7, Hiramoto teaches a semiconductor device of claim 1, wherein the first conductivity type is n-type and the second conductivity-type is p-type.

Regarding claim 8, Hiramoto teaches a semiconductor device as in claim 1, wherein the silicon substrate has a first conductivity-type, and includes a well having a second conductivity-type and receiving therein the collector well.

Regarding claim 9, Hiramoto teaches the semiconductor device defined as in claim 8, wherein the bipolar transistor is a PNP transistor.

Regarding claim 10, Hiramoto teaches a semiconductor device as in claim 1, further comprising a third annular isolation trench 8 encircling second annular isolation trench, and another annular diffused region disposed between the second annular isolation trench and the third isolation trench while being in contact with the second and third isolation trenches (fig. 11c and column 14, lines 38-67, columns 15-16).

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 2 and 6 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

3. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Samuel Admassu Gebremariam
June 17, 2002


TOM THOMAS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800